



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

Am

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/899,555	07/05/2001	Sadhana S. Rau	16159.010001; P5909	1645
22511	7590	04/08/2005	EXAMINER	
OSHA & MAY L.L.P. 1221 MCKINNEY STREET SUITE 2800 HOUSTON, TX 77010			REFAI, RAMSEY	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2154	

DATE MAILED: 04/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/899,555	Applicant(s) RAU ET AL.	
	Examiner Ramsey Refai	Art Unit 2154	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 November 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 05 July 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

Responsive to Amendment filed November 24, 2004. Claims 2-4 have been amended.

Claims 1-36 are pending.

Specification

1. The disclosure is objected to because the serial numbers of cross-referenced applications have not been updated.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 7, 12, 14-19, and 31-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mendez (U.S. Patent No. 6,151,606) in view of AAPA (Applicant Admitted Prior Art).

4. As per claim 1, Mendez teaches a method for propagating changes from a local workspace that is accessible by a client to a remote workspace that is accessible by a server, comprising:

generating a request from the client to the server for a workspace (**abstract, Figure 1 and 7; instantiator**);

obtaining selected data from the local workspace and requesting the server to store the selected data in the workspace (**abstract**); and

updating the remote workspace with the data in the workspace (**abstract**).

5. Mendez fails to teach creating a temporary workspace.

6. However, AAPA teaches creating child workspaces with copies of the parent workspace, which are, used temporary (**paragraph [0007]**). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Mendez and AAPA because AAPA's use of creating temporary workspace in Mendez system would allow for a developer to obtain a copy of the parent file and modify it without interfering with the work of other developers.

7. As per claim 7, Mendez teach obtaining selected data from the local workspace comprises determining a set of different files between the local and remote workspaces (**abstract**).

8. As per claim 12, Mendez teach checking for physical existence of the local workspace and requesting the server to check for physical existence of remote workspace prior to requesting the server to create the temporary workspace (**column 5, lines 9 – 13; network connections**).

9. As per claim 14, Mendez teaches updating history of transactions in the remote workspace after the remote workspace is updated (**column 11, lines 10 – 40**).

10. As per claim 15, Mendez teaches updating history of transactions in the local workspace after the remote workspace is updated (**column 11, lines 10 – 40**).

11. As per claim 16, Mendez teaches deleting the workspace after the remote workspace is updated (**abstract**).

12. As per claim 17, the claim contains similar limitations as claim 1, therefore is rejected under the same rationale.

13. As per claim 18, Mendez teach a authenticating the client prior to sending selected data to client (**Figure 8 and column 10, lines 50 –55**).

14. As per claims 19, 31-36, these claims contain similar limitations as claims 1, 7, 12, and 15-16 above, therefore are rejected under the same rationale.

15. Claims 2-6, 13, and 25-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mendez (U.S. Patent No. 6,151,606) in view of AAPA (Applicant Admitted Prior Art) in further view of Bayeh et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,098,093).

Art Unit: 2154

16. As per claim 2, Mendez and AAPA fail to teach at least one servlet parses requests sent to the server and delegates processing of the requests to an appropriate server object in the server.

17. However, Bayeh et al teach the use of servlets and servlet engines to facilitate client requests (**Figure 3 and column 8, line 42 – column 9, line 19**). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Mendez, AAPA and Bayeh et al because AAPA's use of creating temporary workspace and Bayeh et al's use of servlets in Mendez system would reduce system overhead and execute quickly because servlets are automatically threaded and are highly responsive.

18. As per claim 3, Mendez teach a remote workspace is stored in a repository (**column 4, lines 52-63**).

19. As per claim 4, Mendez teaches a server object implements an interface having a set of methods that can be invoked to access the repository and the remote workspace (**column 2, line 10 – column 3, line 15**).

20. As per claim 5, Mendez fails to teach the client communicates with the server using HTTP protocol.

21. However, Bayeh et al teach the use of HTTP protocols (**column 1, lines 20-30**).). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of

Mendez and Bayeh et al because Bayeh et al's use of HTTP protocol in Mendez system would allow for a client to communicate to a server via the Internet to exchange messages.

22. As per claim 6, Mendez fails to teach the client communicates with the server using HTTPS protocol.

However, Bayeh et al teach the use of HTTPS protocols (**column 1, lines 20-30**).). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Mendez and Bayeh et al because Bayeh et al's use of HTTPS protocol in Mendez system would allow for a client to safely communicate to a server via the Internet to exchange messages.

23. As per claim 13, Mendez teach the use updating the remote workspace with the data in the temporary workspace (**abstract**).

24. Mendez and AAPA fail to teach a server locking method.

25. However, Bayeh et al teach a server with a locking technique to prevent servlets from overwriting each other (**abstract and column 12, lines 29 – 58**).). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Mendez, AAPA and Bayeh et al because AAPA's use of creating temporary workspaces and Bayeh et al's use of a locking technique in Mendez system would prevent other users access to remote workspace while the user it obtaining a file or updating a file from the remote workspace.

26. As per claims 25-29, these claims contain similar limitations as claims 2, 3, 5, and 6 above, therefore are rejected under the same rationale.

27. Claims 8-11, 20-24, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mendez (U.S. Patent No. 6,151,606) in view of AAPA (Applicant Admitted Prior Art), and in further view of Maddalozzo, Jr. et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,878,218).

28. As per claims 8 - 11, Mendez teaches the use of different files in different workspaces **(abstract)**.

29. Mendez and AAPA fail to teach the use filenames and checksums to determine the set of different files, comparing the filenames and checksums, having files with checksums that differs from that of a corresponding filename in the set of different files and having files that include a filename that differs from the set of different files.

30. However, Maddalozzo, Jr. et al teach the use filenames and checksums to verify file availability, file difference and checksum differences in the set of different files (**column 9, line 15 – column 10, line 47**). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Mendez, AAPA, and Maddalozzo, Jr. et al because AAPA's use of creating temporary workspace and Maddalozzo, Jr. et al's use of comparing files using filenames and checksums in Mendez's system would allow a user to obtain a copy of a file from a remote workspace into a temporary workspace, verify that they are different and then modify the file in the temporary workspace. Once modification is complete, a user can then check file availability in the remote workspace and if not available, transfers file to the remote workspace and check if the entire file has been transferred using checksums.

31. As per claims 20-24 and 30, these claims contain similar limitations as claims 8-11 above, therefore are rejected under the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

32. Applicant's arguments filed have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

- In the remarks, the applicant argues in substance that:
 - A. Mendez and AAPA fail to teach the following:
 - creating a temporary workspace;
 - storing selected data into the temporary workspace;
 - updating the remote workspace with the data in the temporary workspace;
 - and
 - checking for physical existence of the local workspace and remote workspace prior to requesting the server to create the temporary workspace.
 - B. Mendez fails to teach generating a request from the client to the server for a workspace;
 - C. Mendez teaches the use of an interface but the present invention requests permission directly from the server to create a workspace without intervention of an interface;
 - D. AAPA does not imply in any way the use of a temporary workspace;
 - E. Bayeh fails to teach the following:

- creating a temporary workspace;
- storing selected data into the temporary workspace;
- updating the remote workspace with the data in the temporary workspace;
and
- checking for physical existence of the local workspace and remote workspace prior to requesting the server to create the temporary workspace.

F. Maddalozzo does not teach using the filename and checksum to determine a *set* of different files.

- In response to:

A. The examiner respectfully disagrees because:

- AAPA does teach creating a temporary workspace. Although AAPA does not use the word *temporary*, AAPA does teach the creation of child workspaces that are used by developers provisionally in order to modify individual versions of the same file without interfering with work of other developers (**paragraph [0007]**);
- AAPA teaches storing the selected data into the temporary workspace. A version of the same file from the parent workspace is selected and copied onto the child workspaces (**paragraph [0007]**). Mendez also teaches storing selected data into a temporary workspace. Data is downloaded from a remote site in order to manipulate data. A general synchronization module synchronizes the manipulated data with the workspace data stored at the remote site (**abstract**);

- AAPA also teaches updating the remote workspace with the data in the temporary workspace. AAPA teaches that developers modify copies of parent workspace files in child workspaces. After the files are modified in the child workspaces, they are merged and copied to the parent workspace (**paragraph [0007]**). Mendez also teaches updating the remote workspace with data in the temporary workspace. Data is downloaded from a remote site in order to manipulate data. A general synchronization module synchronizes the manipulated data with the workspace data stored at the remote site (**abstract**) and
- Mendez teaches checking for physical existence of the local workspace and remote workspace prior to requesting the server to create the temporary workspace. Mendez teaches that the system may include additional information such as network connections, memory, etc. before transferring the information (**column 5, lines 9-13**).

B. The examiner respectfully disagrees because Mendez does teach generating a request from the client to the server for a workspace (**abstract**). An instantiator requests the workspace data manager provide workspace data using an interface to manipulate access and synchronize workspace data (**column 2, lines 10-35**).

C. Applicant is arguing that Mendez teaches the use of an interface but the present invention requests permission directly from the server to create a workspace without intervention of an interface. This/These limitation(s) are not found in the claims. Claimed subject matter not the specification is the measure of the invention. Disclosure contained in the specification cannot be read into the claims for the purpose of avoiding prior art. In

Art Unit: 2154

re Sporck, 55 CCPA 743, 386 F.2d 924, 155 USPQ 687 (1986); In re Self, 213 USPQ 1, 5 (CCPA 1982); In re Priest, 199 USPQ 11, 15 (CCPA 1978).

Applicant's specification does teach the use of an interface to communication with the server.

"[0021] Referring now to the accompanying drawings, FIG. 1 shows a block diagram of a teamware system 5 that allows transactions to be executed between a local workspace 10 and a remote workspace 15. The local workspace 10 is local in the sense that a teamware client 20 uses local access methods or a network file sharing protocol to access the contents of the local workspace 10. The remote workspace 15 is remote in the sense that the teamware client 20 does not use local methods or a network file sharing protocol to access the contents of the remote workspace 15. In the figure, the remote workspace 15 is shown inside a repository 25, such as described in U.S. patent application Ser. No. _____, entitled "Teamware Repository of Teamware Workspaces," herein incorporated by reference. In accordance with this embodiment, the teamware system 5 includes a teamware server 30 that manages and provides access to the repository 25 and remote workspace 15. *The teamware client 20 communicates with the teamware server 30 via an application programmer interface (API).* The teamware client 20 executes the transaction logic locally and sends certain commands to the teamware server 30 to be executed at the teamware server 30. The result, such as the content of a file, an object, or an exception, is returned to the teamware client 20."

Claim 4 of the instant application also states:

"4. The method of claim 4, wherein a server object implements *an interface having set of methods that can be invoked to access the repository and the remote workspace.*"

D. The examiner respectfully disagrees because AAPA does imply in any way the use of a temporary workspace. AAPA does teach creating a temporary workspace.

Although AAPA does not use the word *temporary*, AAPA does teach the creation of child workspaces that are used by developers temporarily in order to modify individual

versions of the same file without interfering with work of other developers (**paragraph [0007]**).

E. The examiner asserts that Bayeh was used to in combination with Mendez and AAPA to teach some of the limitations that were not taught in Mendez or AAPA not to teach creating a temporary workspace; storing selected data into the temporary workspace; updating the remote workspace with the data in the temporary workspace; and checking for physical existence of the local workspace and remote workspace prior to requesting the server to create the temporary workspace. These were taught in Mendez and AAPA. Please see response to point A above.

F. The examiner respectfully disagrees because Maddalozzo does teach using the filename and checksum to determine a *set* of different files. Maddalozzo teaches “A requesting computer 12A *to send the newest version of file 14F which is resident within the "common cache" and which is more current than and different from the copy of file 14F in local cache 33AC.* Method step 118 accomplishes this by sending the query to computer 12A with *the timestamp and checksum* for the copy of file 14F in cache 33AC” (**column 10, lines 6-13**).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ramsey Refai whose telephone number is (571) 272-3975. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 - 5:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2154

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ramsey Refai
Examiner
Art Unit 2154

RR
March 22, 2005


JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100